

City of San José

Coyote Valley Specific Plan

DRAFT Initial Draft CVSP Comments Received by Topic – January to May 2007

Note: The summary of comprehensive comments below was taken from the following meetings posted on the CVSP website at the following link: www.sanjoseca.gov/coyotevalley/.

- Summary of Task Force Meeting, dated December 11, 2006
- Summary of Task Force Meeting, dated January 22, 2007
- Summary of Community Meeting, dated January 11, 2007
- Historic Landmarks Commission Comments, dated February 7, 2007
- Planning Commission Study Session Comments, dated March 14, 2007
- Summary of Technical Advisory Meeting, dated March 28, 2007
- Comments from Gladwyn d'Souza, dated February 17, 2007
- Comments from Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority, dated March 15, 2007

LAND-USE AND URBAN DESIGN

WORKPLACE/JOBS:

- The “guiding principles” should encourage major corporate users to locate in Coyote Valley.
- The plan should be more flexible to accommodate changes and allow all workplace users and all floor area ratios (FARs).
- The Plan should be flexible and indicate average densities, especially in the campus industrial areas.
- Would like to find creative ways to solve concerns of corporate users, rather than denying a project because it does not fit with the Plan.
- Would like more information on jobs, such as the types of jobs that would be permitted and the quality of jobs.
- Suggested adding another section to the Plan on flexibility of restrictions for businesses.
- The City should not sacrifice the overall goals of the Plan to large corporate users.
- The General Plan currently designates Coyote Valley for campus industrial uses. The FARs were generated from Tandem and Apple’s plans back in the 1970’s. There was an average FAR of about .30 in all of Coyote Valley, which is very low. The minimum FAR in Coyote Valley should be .45 to .50. We need to be careful because some of the designations in the Plan have FARs that are too low for Coyote Valley. Overall, there is sufficient acreage to accommodate the 50,000 jobs, but the FARs should be more flexible.
- Need an infrastructure amenity package early on to encourage workplace users to locate.
- Should contact big workplace users such as IBM and Divco as to whether the Plan is workable for them.
- The designation of 564 acres at .50 - .55 FARs would provide 50,000 jobs.
- Some companies have existing entitlements and approved permits in North Coyote Valley. What does that do to the Plan?
- Page 24 and 28 of the Initial Draft should note that the requirement for industry-driving jobs and non-industry driving jobs goes beyond the City Council requirement.
- Should not use the Sphere of Influence to determine the number of jobs required.
- Should have a lot of amenities available to attract corporate businesses.
- Do not want to minimize densities. This would discourage businesses from locating in Coyote Valley.

RESIDENTIAL/HOUSING:

- Cannot make an assumption about the amount of affordable housing needed without knowing the demand for it.
- Questioned the use of the term, “alleviate” (pg. 140 in the Initial Draft) in the discussion of San Jose’s housing sales costs.
- The Plan should provide more low-density one story residences for seniors.
- Is there enough incentive to provide ELI, VLI, etc.? Is there going to be employment for those groups? The provision of ELI and VLI housing should be a priority.

SCHOOLS:

- The Plan should have a land-banking feature for an additional high school site to accommodate student growth.
- The MHUSD would like two separate high school campuses in Coyote Valley.
- The Plan should designate a total of 80 acres for two separate high school sites; one location could be on Palm Avenue, and an additional location shared with Gavilan College. A 60-acre site for 3,000 students is unmanageable, especially if there is student growth in the future.
- There should be a mitigation agreement regarding schools adopted into the Plan.
- Would like to see a state-of-the-art high school.
- Gavilan College should remain designated workplace industrial. It should be analyzed as workplace.

LAND USE DESIGNATIONS/FLOOR AREA RATIO (FAR):

- There are existing zoning designations in Coyote Valley. If the existing zoning approvals are implemented prior to the adoption of the Plan, the Plan may need to be revised to accommodate them.
- There should be flexibility in the FARs in the Core.
- Suggested starting at a range of .40 - .70 FARs, then increasing to .80 – 1.5 FAR over time.
- There are too many parcels and colors on the Plan. The parcels should not be divided up into so many land use designations.
- Suggested decreasing the number of land uses, but have a wider spread of FARs.
- The Plan should maintain flexibility. The original plan was more general, but now it is too detailed. The Plan should allow for different land uses, even if they are not designated on the map.
- The Plan would not work unless the jobs and housing are developed together.
- People like to live close to where they work.
- Should be more flexible lifestyle rather than a dense urban environment. High-rise development is a problem.
- By limiting auto-oriented businesses, big box stores, etc., is the Plan encouraging people to drive elsewhere for these services? We want to keep people out of cars, but we may be pushing people to go elsewhere for some services and activities. Need a balance.

MISC.:

- What are we willing to give-up to reach our goals in Coyote Valley?
- What level of arts would be accommodated in Coyote Valley? There is great value for performing arts venues. Do not want to see it “off the table.”
- Multiple centers vs. one large venue attract more participation and builds community.
- May want to have smaller facilities, but not as large as Downtown San Jose.

- Should think futuristically. Coyote Valley would attract people from all over and bring more people into San Jose.
- If the City of San Jose does not adopt this Plan, then there would be scattered development in Coyote Valley.
- Flexibility is important to respond to the market.

IMPLEMENTATION

- Suggested that the Plan include a 40 – 50 year timeline for the build-out of Coyote Valley.
- How would the Plan meet the jobs/housing goal if there is too much flexibility? There should be a tracking tool to assure the goals are met.
- Suggested having a five-year review to check how the Plan is meeting objectives.
- If objectives are not met, then do not do the Plan. The City should “get it right” or not do it.
- Need to have an enforcement tool to ensure goals are carried out.

ENVIRONMENTAL

- Would like to see more information on wildlife in the appendices. A lot of wildlife would be displaced.
- Concerned about the ballfields in Laguna Seca since it is a habitat for migratory wild birds.
- The Plan should require environmental stewardship, not just encourage it.
- Elements of Sustainability are not clear or well laid out, and they should be clarified. Objective 23 in Chapter 4 should also take into consideration long term sustainability. Needs to be accommodated in footprint. Section 23 needs to accommodate land uses so sustainable transportation is viable within the City.
- There should be more information in the Plan about groundwater quality and protection. The Plan does not emphasize that groundwater protection is a critical goal.
- Development on the east side of Monterey Road is a concern. Looking for no development on the east side or at least a smaller footprint of development.
- Runoff from the Coyote Valley Parkway into Fisher Creek is a concern.
- A smaller environmental footprint would be ideal.
- The language in the Plan for sustainability measures and TDM measures should be revised from “should” to “shall”.
- Suggested comparing the Greenbelt Alliance’s “Getting it Right” vision for Coyote Valley with the City’s CVSP Initial Draft.
- Need to start discussions with the County regarding the acquisition of land along Coyote Creek.
- The Plan should have a lighter footprint
- Suggested a larger setback along Coyote Creek.
- Should include drought tolerant plants.
- Pleased with the Plan’s environmental stewardship policies. Should try to encourage solar as well. Want San Jose to be the global leader. Coyote Valley should be a green community.
- Recommended LEED for rental buildings and buildings in the private realm.
- The Plan should clarify whether there would be “purple pipe” water for public/private use?
- The lake could be used for water banking.
- Buildings should be LEED certified.

FINANCE/PHASING

- There should be a cost analysis on government facilities.
- The Plan would grow and evolve over time. The vision and information on economic development should be updated accordingly to stay current.
- Costs will always go up so we should look at costs and benefits. Sometimes cutting back is more detrimental.
- The Plan calls for protection for hillsides in the Santa Cruz mountain range and the Diablo mountain range. It is assumed that funding would be from Santa Clara Open Space Authority, but that is not realistic. There needs to be other funding sources.
- When the development process starts, there should be an infrastructure plan. Costs may be high if one business needs to provide all infrastructure.
- Would like to see a funding model for the construction of the schools.

TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION

- More priority should be given to pedestrian and bicycle mobility.
- Suggested looking at golf carts as a mobility mode.
- The Plan needs to be flexible enough to accommodate commuters.
- How are people going to access Coyote Valley before transit infrastructure is in place? How do the Plan's infrastructure requirements coordinate with the infrastructure that already exists in the City?
- There are no plans for the Santa Clara Valley Transit Authority to provide additional services in Coyote Valley. There is not enough funding for the transit expansion. There should be high densities to support transit if there is no additional funding.
- Should be more jobs near the Caltrain station to reduce traffic on Bailey over the Hill.
- There are fiscal barriers to extend the VTA into Coyote Valley.
- The Caltrain tracks in Coyote Valley are owned by Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR); URPP is difficult to work with.
- There would be modest ridership at the Coyote Valley station in the future (It would be similar to the Sunnyvale station).
- Unclear how the pedestrian and bicycle access functions between east and west Coyote Valley, particularly at the end of the Central Commons.
- Pedestrian overpasses need to be attractive and well-lit with signage.
- Walkability studies indicate people are willing to walk further to a transit stop if the walk is pleasant. The quality of the walk is more important than the distance.
- Should consider active senior design in the Plan.
- Should consider handicap accessibility in the Plan.
- Would there be airport enhancements?
- Need access to other parts of San Jose, and we need to think of transportation.
- The increase in population would require more infrastructure than the proposed BRT system and Caltrain station would be able to accommodate.
- *Comments from Gladwyn d'Souza, dated February 12, 2007 – please see "Attachment A"*
- *Comments from VTA, dated March 15, 2007 – please see "Attachment B"*

PARKING

- The proposed parking ratio of two per thousand is unrealistic in the initial phases for Coyote Valley.
- Can Coyote Valley be built-out with 2 parking spaces per 1,000 square-feet?
- May need higher parking ratios initially until more infrastructure is in place.
- Two parking spaces per 1,000 square-feet may work over time, but not at the early phases.

- The Plan assumes that everyone that would work in Coyote valley would live there. If everyone does not live in Coyote Valley, there is not enough parking.
- May be difficult to get banks to finance two parking spaces per 1,000 square-feet.
- Need flexible parking requirements to stay competitive. Suggested phasing implementation for parking. Parking ratios can be reduced gradually once transit is in place.
- The structured parking goal should be 2 to 2.5 spaces per 1,000 square-feet. The Plan could start with 4 spaces per 1,000 square-feet, and then transition into shared parking in the future. Suggested looking at San Jose Downtown parking reduction strategies as a guideline for the Coyote Core.
- Suggested having parking triggers as certain development occurs.
- The Plan should reduce surface parking lots.
- Need to have a minimum of 4 parking spaces per 1,000 square-feet in the workplace areas. A company would not locate in Coyote Valley unless there is sufficient parking.

HISTORICAL

- How can historic bridges be saved in the Hamlet?
- After the EIR is circulated and certified, the historic buildings should be added to the City inventory.
- Should keep historic buildings in original location.
- Could create a “Kelly Park”-like area; relocate historic buildings to one location.
- Need more graphic materials of the Hamlet.
- Should preserve buildings along Monterey Road in existing locations, not just in the Hamlet.
- Significant buildings should be preserved.
- If a historic building cannot be saved, should have a justified reason.
- Should try to preserve bridges, even if they are not significant.
- Could reuse bridges (i.e. convert to pedestrian walkways).
- Concerned that there is no wording in the Plan to preserve buildings on site.
- Can incorporate historical symbols into Coyote Valley (i.e. El Camino Real).
- Ranches could be center of history to commemorate agricultural heritage.
- Need a policy in the Plan to preserve buildings in place.
- Can incorporate sites into educational opportunities.
- Existing sites can celebrate history.
- Be authentic; do not create something that does not exist (do not want a “Disneyland”).
- Suggested looking at European cities (i.e. Rome) for ideas on incorporating historical sites in the City.
- Sites are educational; they are open history.
- The Principle listed in the Plan is a good start, but it identifies the Hamlet as the only cultural resource district. There is no mention of other historic resources and maintaining them in their original locations.
- Should do restoration of soft elements in the Hamlet – landscape, street furniture, etc. It should encourage people to go there. Do not want to make it into a theme park.

GREENBELT/AGRICULTURE

- The Santa Clara County Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) is in the process of making a policy requiring 1 acre of mitigation for the loss of 1 acre of prime agricultural land. This requirement assumes there is a lot of mitigation land in the Greenbelt. The amount of money set aside for the Greenbelt is not sufficient for the Plan; it was a placeholder and should be updated.

- Pleased to see an implementation program for the Greenbelt in the Plan.
- There should be agricultural mitigation studies on the urban part of Coyote Valley that would fund Greenbelt activities. The developer could pay a one time fee instead of an upfront fee to support the Greenbelt strategy.
- The Greenbelt area is a depressed area, and it is not a good farming area.
- Need the support of property owners to make it a good farmland area.
- The Plan should indicate what is currently happening with the agricultural lands in Coyote Valley, and then integrate it into the Plan.
- Suggested having a separate entity to manage agriculture land.
- If programs for the agriculture lands are publicly funded, there should be as much information as possible to help the programs be successful.
- Farming and agriculture would not be successful in the Greenbelt. Suggested identifying alternative uses for that area, such as large estate homes or equestrian ranches.
- Would like to see more planning done in the Greenbelt, it is considered prime agricultural land. Could have Greenhouses.
- Soil in the Greenbelt is not conducive to expanded agricultural activities.
- Farming is not economically viable in the area. There is no infrastructure to support farming.
- Instead of developing agricultural land in Coyote Valley, developers and the City should redevelop parts of San Jose that currently have the infrastructure and the services to support an increase in population needs and demands.
- Should preserve Coyote Valley and utilize growing fresh organic vegetables and fruits.

TECHNICAL/TEXT ISSUES

- Some topics are not addressed in detail, such as child care and health care.
- There should be more information on how the CVSP would contribute to the City of San Jose as a whole.
- Some sections are laid out more thoroughly than other sections.
- The Plan should be clear enough for the entire City to understand.
- Pleased to see that not much jargon is used in the document; it should be written in readable language.
- The graphic layout of the vision should be improved and emphasized.
- Suggested a text amendment to provide density averages relative to land use colors on particular parcels.
- The plan should provide general goals, and not be too prescriptive.
- The acronyms in the Plan should be clarified.
- The Initial Draft is lacking in technical content.
- Unclear how outside agency input has been incorporated into the Plan.
- Suggested the wording in Policy 232 and 233 (regarding schools) in the Plan should be changed from “require” to “encourage” to maintain flexibility.

Last Revised: 05/15/2007

Y:\04.09.07_CVSP Initial Draft Comments_comprehensive.doc

ATTACHMENT A

From: Gladwyn d'Souza
Sent: Saturday, February 17, 2007 4:10 PM
To: Walsh, Susan
Subject: Re: Bicycle and pedestrian Issues with the CVSP Initials Draft

Hi Susan,

I'll take this opportunity to include minor edits necessary in the draft.

The BPAC is going to be concerned about trails (connectivity with the region and as commuting options) bike lanes as 'a complete street' system, bike parking for shopping and work, bike recreation on existing "hilly, rural" CV roads, bike stations, and pedestrian amenities especially to transit (which this plan does an excellent job on in Chapter 6).

page 13 says comprehensive pedestrian and transit oriented mixed use. Mention that its possible to traverse the valley without getting on a road which should increase the number of middle and high school students getting to school on foot or bicycle. Parking is going to be difficult and bike/ped features are going to be abundant and convenient.

page 18 paragraph 2 on "A variety of recreational uses that abound..." needs to have bike riding in rural roads and mountain biking acknowledged. Page 27 has related material. There should be a sentence added that reads to the effect: "Coyote Valley's rural roads provide abundant rural opportunities for road bikes to travel across the region and the surrounding region has trails enjoyed by mountain bicycles."

page 27 paragraph 3 under Promote Environmental Stewardship and Preserve Open Space ends with the following sentence,

which should include the capitalized words:

Development patterns and criteria assure that publicly accessible walks, trails, or narrow roads WILL CONTINUE TO define the interface between urban and open space.

page 29 introduction to section 5 links sustainable transportation by walkers and cyclists as a necessary means to reduce energy consumption and pollution caused by automobiles.

page 38 policy 31 recognizes in place infrastructure for trails, bikeways and supports the concept of focus on pedestrians, bicycles, and transit over private cars.

ADD A DELINEATION ii) Mixed use density will maintain the bikeable network of rural roads around Coyote Valley by eliminating development pressure along these roads.

PAGE 42 Mobility Infrastructure says highest level of service goes to pedestrians and articulates a hierarchial system of transport with peds on the broad bottom of the modal pyramid and single occupancy autos at the narrow top.

Page 42 Paragraph on "Sidewalks, bicycle lanes, and trails" acknowledges the importance of designing slow streets.

ADD A LINE- Two lane streets with speeds below 20 mph accommodate golf carts which naturally bring the overall speed down. (Could also go into section c on page 46)

Page 43- Streets will be as narrow as is functionally possible with bike lanes.

Page 53 Overall density committed to pedestrian/transit orientation

page 54 public and private opportunity for medical clinics and related infrastructure

page 55 second purple paragraph- vibrant mixed uses with bicycle and pedestrian proximity

Page 65 paragraph one under Introduction assures that vehicular accommodation does not negatively impact pedestrian, bicycle, and transit experience (and add the following words) OR CONNECTIVITY...

with a minimum of street crossings.

Objective 1- a coherent system.. with a network of grade separation.

page 66 policy 2- direct and convenient bike ped connections and comprehensive in the approach to its development.

page 67 Trails sub section 2- a beautiful and continuous system... with connections downtown.

page 68 Bicycle only places...All Streets will accommodate bike traffic as a shared use.

PAGE 69 paragraph one "secure bicycle parking would be required..."

(You will probably get a question here on a bike station at Caltrain stop similar to the one in Palo Alto at the University stop. An addition here should read INCLUDING A BIKE STATION AT THE CALTRAIN STOP WHEN WARRANTED.)

Page 70 Policy 10 Create a way finding signage system. This is a good time to ask the BPAC for a policy on signage for Santa Clara County to address trails and roads for bikes and peds.

Page 79 Parking will be restricted and charged to reduce single occupancy autos.

Page 83 TDM will be used (similar to Stanford and Lockheed.)

Chapter 6 goods delivery minimizes the need to drive.

Please don't hesitate to give me a call is you have questions.

Thanks,

Gladwyn

ATTACHMENT B

Coyote Valley Specific Plan VTA's Comments

March 15, 2007

Dear Susan,

Thank you for allowing VTA staff the opportunity to review and comment on the Coyote Valley Specific Plan. The Coyote Valley proposal appears to be a unique opportunity for San Jose to build a community rich in urban amenities while upholding to the sustainable vision of the 21st century.

The following are a list of comments we would like the City of San Jose staff to reconsider and/or address to ensure the Coyote Valley visions are carried forward with the least complications in the future.

Bicycle and Pedestrian Circulation

- VTA thinks it is great that CV is focusing on a walk- and bicyclable centric community. However it does not address the types of protection offered to these commuters during winter months when it is raining. Perhaps store fronts should be required to have awnings so pedestrians are protected from the rain.
- The road network within the community core should be designed such that the travel time by foot or bike is equivalent to or better than the travel time to make the same trip by car.
- Eliminating left turns is a good way to reduce the width of intersections; however it does have the potential to create road rage causing drivers to become irritated. In addition to making the environment attractive to pedestrians and bicyclists there should be an emphasis to create a street network that reminds drivers that they are sharing the road network. This can be accomplished by adding such things as pavement colorings at intersections, in-street pedestrian crossings signs and/or in-road warning lights at major crosswalks.

Parking

- Based on p.22 it sounds like the CV Transit Station will be used as a rail hub for commuters outside the CV community; however, the parking section does not address how the community will deal with Park and Ride lots near transit stations.
- VTA staff appreciates that CV is trying to minimize the number of parking spaces available in the community. The idea of consolidating spaces to shared parking conforms to the ideas set in the Community Design and Transportation Manual. However, VTA staff are concerned that parking size should not be compromised to accommodate additional spaces. Motorists should not feel frustrated parking tight parking spaces. VTA is not suggesting all parking spaces need to be designed for big vehicles but there should be a balance between the parking spaces available.
- There needs to be a discussion of bicycle parking in the CV community. Is CV planning on providing parking, are there going to be bicycle lockers at major transit hubs, will bicycle parking be available throughout the community or just at key locations, etc. ?

Transit

BRT

- VTA likes the idea of having a fun circulator transit system for the Coyote Valley community. However, VTA would like the Specific Plan and EIR to clearly state that the service will be completely funded and operated by the Coyote Valley community and not VTA.

LRT

- Page 81 indicates VTA LRT may extend to CV in the future, and continue within the community. VTA is not comfortable with this statement, as at this time VTA has no plans nor have we considered extending LRT to CV.
- VTA Board recently adopted criteria necessary for extension of LRT lines in the county. VTA can only justify extensions when new service meets a set of ridership criteria that allows the agency to meet their farebox recovery goal of 25%. All new service expansion is subject to this criteria and must be evaluated before VTA can consider expansion. At this time VTA has no plans to extend LRT to CV. Please indicate any LRT service considerations will only be considered within the CV community and will be funded solely using CV funding sources. In the future – 2040 – VTA may reevaluate their position to expand LRT to CV based on ridership forecast.

Caltrain

- There is a significant gap between the vision and prominence presented in the Plan of the Caltrain Station in Coyote Valley and the numbers being generated by the VTA model. VTA's 2030 projection is 3700 entries and exits or 1850 daily boardings. This puts the station in the same range as current Sunnyvale boardings and significantly less than Palo Alto, Mountain View and Diridon. Therefore it is hard to rectify this relatively healthy but modest ridership with the statements on pg.48 of the CVSP regarding the Station busy with "commuters going into and out of the Valley, visitors and luggage arriving and departing via train" etc. The authors are obviously trying to paint a picture for the public of a bustling eastern style commuter rail station while at best this will be a Caltrain Station that in 2030 looks like Sunnyvale today. (Caltrain has an obligation to provide safe, reliable service with the least travel time delays. Adding a station shall only be considered if Caltrain can justify ridership exceeds the travel delays associated with stopping at the station).
- Caltrain operations - Caltrain now runs 3 round trips (Northbound in the AM, Southbound in the PM) to South Santa Clara County. We have the ability to increase this to 5 round trips and 7 round trips with completion of Measure A funded improvements, and further ability to "purchase" additional slots from UPRR for a total of 10 round trips. The ability to actually operate this service depends to VTA working with its JPB partners to pay the additional costs of operation (i.e. VTA most likely pays this cost). As always these costs will be measured against supporting the complete range of VTA services on an annual basis. It should be noted that in previous discussions with UPRR, the idea of operating reverse commute service has

been rebuffed. This is not necessarily a determination that would impact a long-range vision plan but in reality, VTA would have to pay UPRR more money and make more track and signal improvements to operate reverse commute.

- Caltrain capital - The cost of a Coyote Valley Station has been estimated at \$14 million. This cost estimate does not support the vision (pg. 48) of "monumental landscape and hardscape" or "outstanding sculptural form" or a pedestrian bridge crossing Monterey Highway. This merely supports a simple platform, stock shelters, signal and trackwork. The question still to be answered, and the CVSP is silent on this issue, is how will any of these improvements be funded.

Heavy Rail

- On pg. 22 and 81 there is a reference to the San Jose Council supporting High Speed Rail (HSR) on Monterey Road. The implication is that this matters to Coyote Valley. It should be clarified that under any circumstance HSR will not stop in Coyote Valley and it really makes no difference to the development.

Air

- The plan mentions helicopter service may be supported by CVSP corporations. If this is the case, should there be some landing ground available within the community to accommodate air traffic.

General

- Will the funds from the financing district be used to Travel Demand Management measures such as offering residents and businesses transit use incentive programs like the eco-pass?
- The reality gap between the CVSP's transit vision and what can really be accomplished is best illustrated on pg. 144, Appendix 9: Transportation Demand Management Measures, which I guess is the City's opening gambit of what they expect developers to fund on behalf of transit. In this Appendix, is the usual menu of "easy-to-implement" improvements such as duckouts, shelters, kiosks, bicycle storage etc. A concession is made to providing shuttle services. The Appendix is silent on how the massive transit infrastructure is to be funded on both the capital and operating sides.
- The CVSP presents a vision to the public and policy makers of a development served by robust rail transit connections to the region but stays silent on the issues of implementation. In my opinion, VTA should request that a modified vision be presented of a CVSP in a "financially constrained" environment of no Caltrain station and only transit services that developer fees are able to support to present a different and again in my opinion, more realistic view to the public.

Pamela Vasudeva
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
(VTA)